UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,493	04/06/2001	Lenard M. Lichtenberger	96606/15UTL	5746

23873 7590 08/13/2002

ROBERT W STROZIER, PLLC
2925 BRIARPARK, SUITE 930
HOUSTON, TX 77042

EXAMINER	
JIANG, SHAOJIA A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1617	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/827,493	Applicant(s) LICHTENBERGER, LENARD M.	
	Examiner Shaojia A. Jiang	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *33-45* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *8* .
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is a response to Applicant's response filed on June 5, 2002 in Paper No. 10. Currently, claims 1-45 are pending in this application. Claims 33-45 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention (see the previous Office Action February 12, 2002).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DAIFOTIS, et al. (WO 9904773) in view of Lichtenberger et al., essentially for reasons US 5,763,422 of record stated in the Office Action dated February 12, 2002.

Applicant's remarks filed on June 5, 2002 in Paper No. 10 with respect to this rejection of claims 1-32 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), of record stated in the Office Action dated February 12, 2002 have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive as to the nonobviousness of the claimed invention over the prior art for the following reasons.

Applicant arguments that there is no motivation to combine because there is no reasonable expectation that their combination would be successful are not found

persuasive. As Applicant admits, Daifotis et al. clearly teaches that bisphosphonates can cause adverse GI effects when ingested. Daifotis et al. also disclose that their invention relates to methods for inhibiting bone resorption in mammals to treat osteoporosis while minimizing the occurrence of or potential for adverse GI effects (see page 1 lines 11-13). Thus, the teachings of Daifotis et al. are seen to provide the motivation to make the present invention in reducing GI toxicity.

Moreover, zwitterionic phospholipids (within the instant claims) are known to be capable of reducing GI irritating (adverse) effects and is therefore useful in combining with NSAID drugs in pharmaceutical compositions since NSAID drugs may cause GI adverse effects, e.g., inducing GI ulcers and bleeding, according to Lichtenberger et al. As discussed in the previous Office Action, one of ordinary skill in the art, therefore, would have reasonably expected that combining one zwitterionic phospholipid and a bisphosphonate in a composition to be administered would reduce or minimize adverse GI effects induced by the bisphosphonate with reasonable expectation for success, absent evidence to the contrary.

Additionally, the teachings of Hovancik et al. (5,869,471, PTO-892) that the combination of NSAIDs and bisphosphonates is useful in improving the therapeutic effect for treating arthritis (bone disorders) (see col. 1-3, especially col.3 lines 3-7), further supports the examiner's position, since that the combination of NSAIDs and bisphosphonates is known to be useful in methods for treating bone disorders, and the combination of NSAIDs and zwitterionic phospholipids is also known to be useful in methods for treating bone disorders. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would

reasonably expect that the combination of bisphosphonates and zwitterionic phospholipids would be successful in treating bone disorders.

Applicant's arguments regarding that "the motivation to combine these to references is derived exclusively from hindsight" have been considered but are not found persuasive. It must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). See MPEP 2145.

Therefore, as discussed above, motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art to make the present invention is seen and no improper hindsight is seen. The claimed invention is clearly obvious in view of the prior art.

The record contains no clear and convincing evidence of nonobviousness or unexpected results for the combination herein over the prior art. In this regard, it is noted that the specification provides no side-by-side comparison with the closest prior art in support of nonobviousness for the instant claimed invention over the prior art.

For the above stated reasons, said claims are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, said rejection is adhered to.

In view of the rejections to the pending claims set forth above, no claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Jiang, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minna Moezie, J.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4612. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1235.

Shaojia A. Jiang, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner, AU 1617
August 2, 2002

RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200